

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Terry V. Sanders,)	Civil Action No.: 1:15-3475-BHH
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	<u>OPINION AND ORDER</u>
)	
Warden of Federal Correctional Institution -)	
Estill)	
)	
Respondent.)	

Petitioner Terry V. Sanders (“Petitioner”), a federal inmate proceeding *pro se*, filed this habeas relief action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. (ECF No. 1.) Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) (1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(c) (D.S.C.), the case was assigned to Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges. On November 24, 2015, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) recommending that the § 2241 petition be dismissed without prejudice and without requiring Respondent to file a return. (ECF No. 6.) Petitioner has filed no objections and the time for doing so expired on December 11, 2015. For the reasons set forth below, the Court agrees with the Report and dismisses the petition *without prejudice*.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the district court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the district court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The court is obligated to conduct a *de novo* review of every portion of the Report to which specific objections have been filed. *Id.* However, the Court need not conduct a *de novo* review when a party makes only “general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982) (“[D]e novo review [is] unnecessary in . . . situations when a party makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendation.”). Furthermore, in the absence of a timely filed, specific objection, the Magistrate Judge’s conclusions are reviewed only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

After a careful review of the record, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Court adopts and incorporates the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 6) by reference into this order. It is therefore ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED *without prejudice* and without requiring Respondent to file a return.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Bruce Howe Hendricks
United States District Judge

December 21, 2015
Greenville, South Carolina

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified that any right to appeal this Order is governed by Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.